

#14

**REQUEST TO RECONSIDER HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT
EXAMINING GROUP: (2873)**

32692

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent
Case No.: 55320US028**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE** **FAX RECEIVED**

First Named Inventor: FLORCZAK, JEFFREY M.

JUL 15 2003

Application No.: 09/898580

Group Art Unit: 2873

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Filed: July 3, 2001

Examiner: Ricky Levern Mack

Title: SHEETING WITH COMPOSITE IMAGE THAT FLOATS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF HOLDING OF ABANDONMENTCommissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
To Fax No.: 703-308-7724	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on:	
Date: 15 July 2003	Signed by: Carolyn V. Peters

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests reconsideration of the holding of abandonment set forth in the Notice of Abandonment mailed on July 11, 2003. This request for reconsideration is timely filed.

On June 26, 2003, the undersigned received a telephone call from the Examiner indicating that the above-identified application was to be abandoned for failure to respond to the outstanding Office Action, which had a mailing date of October 21, 2003. In fact, a Response and a Request for 2-Month Extension of Time was mailed to the USPTO by Applicant on March 21, 2003. In response to the Examiner's phone call on June 26, we promptly sent via facsimile a copy of the papers that were sent to the USPTO on March 21, 2003. It was at this time we realized that we had not received the return postcard identifying the papers filed and showing the U.S. Patent and Trademark receipt stamp.

We were unable to find the return postcard in our office. We called and left a message with the Examiner and stated that we did not have the return postcard with a USPTO receipt stamp. The Examiner called on July 10, 2003 and indicated that the case would have to be abandoned because we were unable to produce the missing postcard.

Application No.: 09/898,580

Case No.: 55320US028

When return postcards are received in our office, they are routed to the appropriate attorney, wherein the receipt of the postcard is noted in a log book and the postcard is taped (or stapled) into the prosecution file.

Because the postcard was not received by our office and the response was apparently not received at the USPTO, the disposition of the response (with the postcard) is open to conjecture. As the signatory of the Certificate of Mailing, the undersigned attorney certified that the response was deposited with the United States Postal Service on March 21, 2003. What happened to the response after that is unclear and not under our control. Therefore, it is not clear as to whether the response arrived at the USPTO and the postcard was lost in its return transit to our office or whether the response never did arrive at the USPTO, hence no response paper and no receipt-stamped postcard.

If any fee is required with this request, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. Because no defect exists in the previous submission, it is respectfully asserted that no fee is owed.

Acknowledgment of the active status of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

15 July 2003
Date

By: Carolyn V. Peters
Carolyn V. Peters, Reg. No.: 33,271
Telephone No.: (651) 736-7929

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833